

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2.

Attachment: Replacement sheet

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful consideration and favorable treatment of the present application in which claims 22-29 stand allowed and claims 7-14 stand objected to.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to include the reference number "264". Applicant has amended Fig. 2 to include this reference number and therefore, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

The specification is objected to based on an informality. Applicant has amended page 11 of the specification and requests withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 13, 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 13 and 21 to replace "front and rear clamp members" with "first and second clamp members". Based on this amendment, withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Claims 1-3, 6, 15-21, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yang. Claims 1 and 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuckerman (U.S. Patent No. 6,382,479); and claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuckerman in view of Garrison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,183,191).

The Yang publication does disclose a pad that is secured to a clamp surface but the pad is secured by receiving a pair of posts into a *closed ended* opening in the resilient pad. The posts form an interference fit with the pad but unlike the barbed post construction of the present invention, the posts do not extend completely through the pad.

The Zuckerman reference is the one we previously reviewed where the pad is secured in an opposite manner by having barbed portions of the pad itself be received within openings formed in the bottom portions of the clamps. However, as with the Yang reference and in contrast to the present invention, the barbed portions of the pad do not extend completely through the bottom portions of the clamps but instead are embedded therein to secure the pads to the clamps.

{W:077350200436us000813979.DOC [REDACTED]}

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the locking features are inserted through the openings of the pads such that the locking features clear the outer surface of the pad resulting in the pad being secured to the clamp. Once the locking features clear the outer surface, they serve to secure the pad to the clamp in a manner completely different than the embedding of a post in the pad itself.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited prior art references show an arrangement where the locking features clear the pad surface and engage the pad surface for holding the pad in place. Thus, this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art references and therefore, claim 1, as amended, should be allowed. In both of the prior art references, the post-like structure does not pass completely through the member that it is secured within but instead merely lies within the closed ended opening. As a result, this feature is lacking in each of the hangers of the prior art references.

**Reconsideration and allowance of amended claim 1 are respectfully requested.**

Claims 2-9 and 11-21 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 1, as amended.

Claim 10 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of claims 1 and 2 and based on the Examiner's comments that claim 10 contains allowable subject matter, amended claim 10 should now be in condition for allowance.

**Claims 22-29 stand allowed.**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 30 and 31, which stand rejected in view of Yang. Claim 30 recites that the resilient pad has flanges formed at each end thereof for insertion underneath the lips of ends walls. The resilient pad being held on the platform by having each flange disposed underneath the lip which pinches the flange against the platform resulting in the pad being securely held on the platform.

Applicant respectfully submit that the Examiner has not indicated how the prior art references disclose the above feature and it is Applicant's position that the prior art references fail to disclose or even suggest such a feature where flange portions of a pad are captured underneath lips. On this basis, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 30.

Claim 31 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 30.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward J. Ellis

Registration No.: 40,389

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachments